

REMARKS

This communication is in response to the Office Action mailed January 31, 2008 in which claims 27-33 were pending. Claims 27-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wu (“Customizable Segmentation of Morphologically Derived Words in Chinese”; February 2003). With the present response, claim 27 is amended, claims 28-30 and 33 are cancelled, and new claims 34-46 are added. For reasons that will be outlined in detail below, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are allowable over the cited Wu reference.

With the present response, independent claim 27 has been amended such that it now includes a step of generating a quantitative value that represents a level of precision with which word type indications were applied in the output indicative of words in the test corpus. Further, as claimed, the generating step comprises generating based on a comparison of the word type indication for words in the output to the predefined word type indications.

Applicant’s specification includes plenty of support for the amendment to claim 27. For example, Applicant invites the Examiner to review the originally filed specification at page 16. At this point, there is a description of an evaluation based on the basis of specific word type indications. There is an example on page 16 of an evaluation based on the assignment of person name word type indications. A specific equation is provided for evaluating the precision with which person name word type indications are assigned with an output that is being evaluated.

It is respectfully pointed out that claim 27 pertains to generating a quantitative value that represents the precision with which word type indications are applied based on a language model that is being evaluated. Notably, this is different than simply evaluating the effectiveness of the word model in terms of performing segmentation. The cited Wu reference may, as the Examiner points out on page 2 of the most recent Office Action, discuss varying segmentation for various types but it does not teach or suggest generating a quantitative value that represents the precision with which word type indications were applied in output generated based on a language model being evaluated.

For at least this reason, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 27 is in allowable form. Dependent claims 34-41 are dependent upon independent claim 27 and are believed to be in allowable form at least for the same reasons discussed above in association with their affiliated independent claim. Further, it is respectfully submitted that some or all of these dependent claims individually recite elements that are patentable based on the merits of their own inherent limitations.

For example, dependent claim 37 further defines the step of generating a quantitative value as being limited to including generation of a quantitative value that represents a level of precision with which person name word type indications were applied in the output. Dependent claim 38 further limits the quantitative value to a representation of a level of precision with which location name type indications were applied in the output. Dependent claim 39 limits the quantitative value to being linked to organization name word type indications. Claims 40 and 41 are also limited to specific types of word type indications. It is respectfully submitted that the cited reference does not teach or suggest generation of a quantitative value indicative of word type indications as noted in these dependent claims. For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are in allowable form based on the merit of their own limitations. These are only examples of dependent claims believed to be allowable based on their own merit.

Independent claim 31 recites a method that includes providing a first set of values for each of a plurality of word types indicative of how the first word segmentation model recognizes each of the plurality of word types. Similarly, a second set of values is provided to indicate how a second word segmentation model recognizes each of the plurality of word types. The first and second set of values are compared to determine effectiveness of the first word segmentation model and the second segmentation model with respect to each of the plurality of word types.

It is respectfully pointed out that claim 31 pertains to an objective way of determining the precision with which word types are assigned to words. While the cited Wu reference may describe varying segmentation for different types of words, there is absolutely no

teaching or suggestion of a generation of values that are specific to a word type and indicative of the precision with which the word type is assigned based on a given segmentation model. Certainly there is no teaching or suggestion of a comparison of multiple segmentation models through an evaluation of how well the models assign word types to words relative to one another.

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claim 31 is in allowable. Dependent claims 32 and 42-46 are dependent upon independent claim 31 and are believed to be in allowable form at least for the same reasons discussed above in association with their affiliated independent claim. Further, it is respectfully submitted that some or all of these dependent claims are in allowable form based on the merit of their own limitations.

For example, dependent claim 42 further defines a claimed comparing step to comparing to provide a first set of values for a person name word type. The cited Wu reference fails to teach or suggest generation of values that are specific to a precision with which a person name word type label is applied. For at least this reason, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claim 42 is in allowable form. Dependent claims 43-46 are similar to claim 42 in that they are also directed to generating values that are specific to a particular word type. These dependent claims are in allowable form based on a similar rationale as described in relation to claim 42. These are just examples of dependent claims that are believed to be allowable based on the merit of their own limitation.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is requested. The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: /Christopher L. Holt/

Christopher L. Holt, Reg. No. 45,844  
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319  
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

CLH:rkp